UNITY

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

(Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Editor, 1880-1918)

John Haynes Holmes, *Editor in Chief*

Louis L. Mann, Curtis W. Reese, *Associate Editors*

A Declaration of Independence

By RAYMOND H. PALMER

In Defense of Freedom

(Concluded)

By JEROME DAVIS

The "Firm Hand" in India

By REGINALD A. REYNOLDS

British Police Violate French Sovereign Rights in India

By TARAKNATH DAS

VOLUME CIX NUMBER 13

Chicago, May 30, 1932

PRICE TEN CENTS

UNITY

Established 1878

Published Weekly October to June — *Subscription $3.00*
Published Bi-Weekly July to September — *Single Copies 10 cents*

UNITY PUBLISHING CO., Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago, Ill.
"Entered as Second-Class Matter, July 30, 1931, at the Post office at Chicago, Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879"

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES, *Editor in Chief*
EDITH LLOYD JONES, *Managing Editor*

Associate Editors
LOUIS L. MANN CURTIS W. REESE

Board of Directors
MRS. S. O. LEVINSON, President
MRS. E. L. LOBDELL, Vice-President
MRS. FRANCIS NEILSON, Treasurer
MRS. ELLA R. NAGELY
MRS. EDITH LLOYD JONES
MRS. O. T. KNIGHT
MR. IRWIN S. ROSENFELS
MR. C. W. REESE
MISS MATILDA C. SCHAFF
MRS. E. E. SMITH
MRS. IRWIN S. ROSENFELS
MR. FRANCIS NEILSON
Secretary: MAY JOHNSON

Editorial Board
EDMUND B. CHAFFEE
ZONA GALE
A. EUSTACE HAYDON
JESSE H. HOLMES
JOSEPH ERNEST MCAFEE
H. R. MUSSEY
M. C. OTTO
RAYMOND H. PALMER
ALSON H. ROBINSON
CLARENCE R. SKINNER
SYDNEY STRONG
ARTHUR L. WEATHERLY

Poetry Editors
LUCIA TRENT
RALPH CHEYNEY

Editorial Contributors
W. WALDEMAR W. ARGOW
DOROTHY WALTON BINDER
PERCY M. DAWSON
JAMES A. FAIRLEY
FREDERICK STARR
JABEZ T. SUNDERLAND
JAMES H. WEST

Foreign Representatives
AUSTRALIA—CHARLES STRONG
AUSTRIA—STEFAN ZWEIG
BULGARIA—P. M. MATTHÉEFF
ENGLAND—HARRISON BROWN
FRED HANKINSON
REGINALD REYNOLDS
CANADA—NORMAN STEWART DOWD
FRANCE—G. DEMARTIAL
ROMAIN ROLLAND
GERMANY—THEODOR HAHN
INDIA—RABINDRANATH TAGORE
JAPAN—NOBUICHIRO IMAOKA
PALESTINE—HANS KOHN
RUSSIA—ALINA HUEBSCH

Contents

	Page
EDITORIAL—	
Notes	195
A Declaration of Independence—RAYMOND H. PALMER	198
Jottings—J. H. H.	199
ARTICLES—	
A World Congress Against War—ROMAIN ROLLAND	195
In Defense of Freedom—JEROME DAVIS	200
The "Firm Hand" in India—REGINALD A. REYNOLDS	202
British Police Violate French Sovereign Rights in French India —TARAKNATH DAS	204
POETRY—	
So Shall It Be—CAROLINE PARKER SMITH	199
THE STUDY TABLE—	
Manchuria—FREDERICK STARR	205
CORRESPONDENCE—	
Disarmament and Budgets—IVAN VON AUW	206
THE FIELD—	
Dangerous Women—*The Arbitrator*, N. Y.	194
Report of Newark (N. J.) Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church—Newark *Evening News*	194
Anti-Militarist Ministers—*The Survey Graphic*	208
Salvation Army on Prohibition	208

The Field

"The world is my country, to do good is my Religion."

Dangerous Women

A meeting of the Women's Peace Union was held at the office of Peace Patriots at which Elinor Byrns was chairman and Frieda Lazarus the principal speaker. A wireless message was read purporting to be from Senator Swanson, American delegate to the disarmament conference at Geneva.

"This is to warn you against the Women's Peace Union whose sign, 'Total Disarmament Now!' is disrupting this conference. Already two of our delegates have voted for their disloyal program and if these belligerent ladies are permitted to continue their propaganda, pacifism may spread even to the League of Nations itself.

"The United States chose me as its peace delegate because I have always advocated a big navy. If the Women's Peace Union had its way, this conference would be our swan-song and our our enemies would think us Woolley.

"If competitive armaments should be abolished, we should be unable to enforce our demands upon China, as Japan is so ably doing; nor could we impose our will upon other weak nations. Are imperialism, patriotism and right by might to be abandoned to please a few women?

"This Women's Peace Union is the same organization that sponsored the resolution to emasculate the United States by removing the war-making power from Congress. This union is opposed to military training, conscription and all defensive measures that make war possible. It does not respect the dead; it has not only raised Lazarus, it has raised hell."

The Arbitrator (New York).

Report of Newark (N. J.) Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church

"With all thinking men, we recognize the challenge to the social order in the recent kidnaping of a child known to all the world.

"We do not minimize the hideousness of that particular crime when we call attention to the fact that this is but one manifestation of a spirit of lawlessness and greed which appears elsewhere in our social life with far less condemnation.

"Is there any real difference between the stealing of one well-known child for ransom and the exploitation of either children or adults for gain? Are the children of miners, starving in the coal fields of Kentucky and West Virginia, any less valuable in the sight of God than this one child of famous parents? Is not lawlessness and greed the same thing, whether manifest in kidnaping or in gang rule and political thievery in our cities or in heartless exploitation of the weak in industry?

"Here is a great and apparently spreading evil in our social life, received with horror in one of its manifestations, but tolerated with com-

(Continued on page 207)

UNITY

"He Hath Made of One All Nations of Men"

Volume CIX MONDAY, MAY 30, 1932 Number 13

A WORLD CONGRESS AGAINST WAR

La Patrie est en danger!

"La Patrie est en danger!" Notre Patrie internationale . . . L'URSS est menacée.

Et par contre-coup, c'est le monde entier qui est à la veille de s'effondrer. . . .

Jamais la menace ne fut plus lourde et plus pressante. L'Europe est livrée aux fascismes du sabre et des affaires. Les démocraties abêties, trahies par leurs chefs parlementaires, n'ont plus aucune force pour réagir. Un monstrueux attentat se prépare,—dont les instruments sont, à l'aile droite le Japon, à l'aile gauche la Pologne et la Roumanie,—dont les meneurs sont, à l'Occident, les impérialismes de l'industrie lourde et de la finance industrielle, servis par leurs valets des gouvernements et par la Société des Nations. D'un jour à l'autre peut se déchainer l'immense conflit qui dévastera toute la terre. Car il est clair qu'aucun pays, aucun homme au monde n'aura licence ni pouvoir de s'y dérober.

Quelques libres veilleurs de l'esprit veulent faire un effort suprême pour secouer le sommeil mortel de l'opinion d'Europe et d'Amérique, gisante sous la narcose de la presse. Le camarade Barbusse a pris l'initiative de convoquer à Genève, avec l'appui d'un Comité dont font partie dès à présent Maxime Gorki et Romain Rolland, le 28 juin prochain, pour le sanglant anniversaire de Sarajevo, un Congrès mondial de tous les partis contre la guerre. Ce Comité s'est adressé à Bernard Shaw, à Albert Einstein, à Heinrich Mann, à Theodore Dreiser, à Upton Sinclair, à John Dos Passos, à H. G. Wells, à Paul Langevin et à Mme Sun-Yat-Sen, dont il attend l'adhésion active. Il fait appel, d'une part, aux intellectuels, de l'autre à tous les grands centres mondiaux des travailleurs de la métallurgie, des industries chimiques et du transport, afin qu'ils nomment des délégués ouvriers à ce Congrès. Il s'agit de former un front uni des Travailleurs intellectuels et manuels, pour arrêter et pour briser la criminelle offensive des impérialismes agresseurs, de l'Occident et de l'Extrême-Orient.—Rassemblement!

ROMAIN ROLLAND.

25 Avril 1932.

The Country Is in Danger!

"The Country is in danger!" Our international country. . . . The URSS is threatened.

And as a result the entire world is at the eve of breaking down. . . .

Never was the threat more serious and more pressing. Europe is being given over to "Fascismes" of the sword and of business. The democracies, made stupid and betrayed by their parliamentary chiefs, no longer have any strength to react. A monstrous plot is being prepared—whose instruments are, at the right wing, Japan, and at the left wing, Poland and Roumania, whose henchmen are, in the Occident, the imperialism of heavy industry and of industrial finance, served by their valets of the governments and by the League of Nations. Any day now the immense conflict may be unloosened which will devastate the whole earth. For it is clear that no country, no man in the world, will be able to escape from it.

A few watchful spirits want to make a supreme effort to shake off the mortal sleep of public opinion in Europe and in America lying under the narcotic of the press. Comrade Barbusse is taking the initiative in calling in Geneva, with the help of a committee whose members already include Maxime Gorki and Romain Rolland, on next June 28th, the bloody anniversary of Sarajevo, a World Congress of all the parties against war. This committee has invited Bernard Shaw, Albert Einstein, Heinrich Mann, Theodore Dreiser, Upton Sinclair, John Dos Passos, H. G. Wells, Paul Langevin and Mme. Sun-Yat Sen, from whom it is awaiting active cooperation. It is appealing on the one hand to the intellectuals, on the other, to all the great world centers of the metal workers, of chemical industries and transportation, so that they may name worker delegates to this Congress. It is a question of forming a united front of the brain and hand-workers to stop and break up the criminal offensive of imperialistic aggressors in the Occident and in the extreme Orient.—Rassemblement!

ROMAIN ROLLAND.

April 25, 1932.

(Addressed the 26th of April to the Russian press and to the French press.)

After a winter of confusion and misery, with cities and towns gone bankrupt in the endeavor to carry the unprecedented burden of charitable relief, the federal government is beginning to wake up to its share of responsibility in the greatest economic crisis in our national history. From the beginning of the trouble, the administration has taken the position that relief of the unemployed must be a charge upon the local agency —the town, or the county, or at the farthest remove, the state. The nation must not be drawn in—this was contrary to the traditional policy of a democracy which must function on the basis of home ties, and neighborliness, and "rugged individualism"! To be sure, in the case of any sudden or dramatic disaster, like a San Francisco earthquake or a Mississippi flood, the federal government has never hesitated to rush to the succor of the afflicted population. But unemployment, for some mystic reason, is different, though we imagine the difference is hardly perceptible to the sufferer. To be evicted for non-payment of rent would seem in the end to be about the same as to be evicted for fire or flood! In any case, the government at Washington has refused to act, and the local units have taken up the job of keeping their people fed and housed and clothed. But relief funds raised by charitable agencies and popular subscriptions have proved totally inadequate; appropriations from public treasuries have failed to meet the emergency; tag-days and block-aide plans have produced a little, but only a little. Meanwhile, the unemployed have suffered in body and in mind far more than was ever necessary, and local governments have at last fallen prostrate and exhausted. Now, when the situa-

tion is far worse than it might otherwise have been, the federal government finds itself faced by a challenge it can no longer evade. It must at last take over the load which other and lesser agencies can no longer carry. And it does it on the old, extravagant, and utterly discredited basis of pure charity! When will the United States become intelligent enough to organize a scientific system of public insurance?

The final chapter of the case of the kidnapped Lindbergh baby leads to but one reaction—that of utter horror that such a deed was possible in a society calling itself civilized. To this should be added disgust at the incompetency of the police which left this mystery unsolved for more than two months' time. A friend of ours, who knows intimately the scene and the people near the Lindbergh home, stated to us at the beginning that the stolen baby would be found not five miles away from his cradle. What was so clearly evident to a well-informed layman should have been at least equally clear to professional detectives. Yet, with wild talk of gangsters, racketeers, bootleggers, and the rest, the police went off wild-goose chasing to New York and Philadelphia, to Canada and the middle West, even to England and the open spaces of the sea. Never was there a more fantastic and ridiculous display of police incompetence. Whether the English or some other highly trained detective force would have found the baby may be problematical; it is certain that such force would have been working on right lines and not wrong lines from the start. But what better things can we expect from our police, who are mere pawns in the game of politics? For if there is any one fundamental difference between the English and the American police, it is that the former are altogether out of politics. The London "bobby," especially the Scotland Yard detective, is a highly professionalized person, trained to his task, immune to corruption, and as free from political uses as a soldier in the army. In this country, *per contra,* the police are invariably political appointees and their main job is that of keeping contact with that underworld which is so inexhaustible a source of graft. What wonder that they fall down whenever a first-class challenge to police efficiency is flung into their faces! Now that accident has come to their aid in the Lindbergh case, they may at last lay hands upon the kidnappers. But the lesson of this case remains—the inability of a political police to protect society!

The Ivar Kreuger tale becomes more and more entrancing as the investigators continue their explorations of this master swindler of our time. Bankers and business men, who dealt with him and did his bidding, agree that the Swedish match king was some kind of a wizard who cast a spell upon them. Certainly these so-called hard-headed financiers acted as though they were in a trance when Kreuger was around. No one of them ever thought to examine his accounts or check up on his statements. They sank millions of dollars of their own money, and of other people's money, in his far-flung enterprises without inquiry of any kind. Lee, Higginson and Co., of Boston, who have cut their first teeth, so we are told, handed over to Kreuger no less than $8,000,000, and accepted his stocks and debentures without the slightest verification. It reads like a fairy-tale—or rather, like every other swindle that has been put over since the beginning of time! For it is never the man—Kreuger, or anybody else—who dazzles, or bewitches, or casts his spell. It is *the millions* that do the magic business. Let any man have the sheer audacity to deal in enormous totals of money and property, and he will invariably "get away with it." For it is wealth that we worship, and wealth to which we bow down whenever it appears. It is pitiful to think of what happens to the common man who goes into any bank or brokerage house, and tries to borrow a few thousand, or even a few hundred, dollars. Securities must be shown and verified; character certificates must be drawn up and sworn to; reputation must be searched clear back to the day of birth. And then the chances are the loan will be refused! We remember the time we tried to transfer a mortgage for $6,400 on a house appraised at $14,500, and could not persuade a single banker to help us out! But let a Kreuger come along, a smug and glittering fraud, who asks not for a hundred, or a thousand, but *millions*—and our financiers tumble over themselves to give him whatever he wants. And we laugh at the "rube" who buys a gold brick!

It's a funny world. Everybody in this country all "het up" over drinks, while the very structure of the nation is cracking! It's like a householder terribly excited over a jug of whiskey missing from his cellar while his home is burning down over his head. Of course, there are explanations. The excitement is to a considerable extent artificially created by propaganda bought and paid for by interests seriously concerned with getting the liquor trade back inside the law. The newspapers are obviously ravenously hungry for the lavish advertising of alcoholic beverages which would match the lavish advertising of cigarettes if the 18th Amendment were repealed. Under the conditions, it is no more surprising that the people are hostile to Prohibitionists today than that they were hostile to Germans during the War. Indeed, when we read the biased press, we are only surprised that the mania of antagonism is not actually more intense. Then, a large part of this Prohibition excitement is due, of course, to the intimate nature of the problem. It is always easier to get people interested in a specific personal

matter than in a general social matter. What I am eating and drinking, or what my neighbor is eating and drinking, is a much more absorbing topic than the Versailles Treaty, or German reparations, or even the Japanese in Shanghai. An issue must be personalized to win public attention, and the drink issue is triumphantly personalized in each and every individual who craves a glass of beer. Then, again, the depression is a factor, and the "wets" are shrewdly taking advantage of it, just as the "drys" as shrewdly took advantage of prosperity. The popular mood now is to "swat" everything that is a part of the *status quo,* to make a change in the assurance that it can't hurt and it may help. The same restless temper that teaches men to attack Mr. Hoover just because he is president in these dire days, teaches men also to attack the 18th Amendment for similar reasons. The frying-pan is hot, so we must jump, even though it's into the fire. Hence, in the greatest political and economic crisis in modern history, Americans think and talk of little but drinks and drinking. It's a funny world!

The sensational address of Professor Ernest A. Hooton, of Harvard, before the Philadelphia meeting of the American Philosophical Society, would seem to go far toward reviving and re-establishing the late ideas of the famous Lombroso on criminal types. In recent years, the pendulum has swung far toward the social, or environmental, theory of crime. Criminals, apart from certain mentally abnormal individuals, are quite like other people; if they go wrong, it is only because they are born in the slums rather than on Beacon Street or Park Avenue. Lombroso insisted, to the contrary, that criminals are a distinct breed, as definitely identifiable as albinos or cretins—and so apparently, does Professor Hooton! During a period of five years, he has been studying more than 16,000 inmates of penal institutions and insane asylums, and has compared these with some 2,000 members of the non-criminal population. The results, he says, are unmistakable—the criminal has physical characteristics so precise that he can be classified with others of his same type into a fixed group of social offenders. Professor Hooton declares that, on the basis of his charts and measurements, he can describe the distinctive features of any specified criminal group.

> First-degree murderers, for example, "diverge significantly from total criminal population, in that they are older, heavier, taller, bigger-chested, with greater head circumferences, narrower foreheads, long and relatively narrower noses, broader jaws, broader ears, relatively narrower shoulders, relatively shorter trunks, relatively longer heads, less head hair, more body hair, straighter hair, more pronounced forehead slope, more convex noses, fewer and poorer teeth, both flatter and more projecting ears, less facial asymmetry, etc."

Other criminals, says Professor Hooton, have in the same way their peculiar physical characteristics. He even goes so far as to assert that bootleggers differ from other criminals through the possession of certain features which are their own. Whether this theory is true or not, we do not know. We are no expert in penology! But it is enormously interesting and important, and we believe it should be investigated to the very end.

The economic depression has some good results. It is educating the churches, for example, to social radicalism. Our readers may remember the utterance of the Pope, a year ago, when he denounced "the vast differences between the few who hold excessive wealth and the many who live in destitution" as "a grave evil" in modern society. In April the Methodist Conference of the metropolitan area of New York unanimously adopted a report which said:

> The principal means of production and distribution, which are now privately owned, controlled and operated, mainly for the benefit of a relatively small proportion of our population, must be brought under some form of social ownership and management.

At the great meeting in Atlantic City the Methodist bishops called upon both capital and labor to "remake the whole structure of industrial life," and added:

> If reconstruction is made impossible as an orderly development a breaking point is sure to come, as a result of which much that is good in our present civilization will perish in the attempt to do away with much that is evil.

A year ago the Presbyterian General Assembly called for

> . . . revision of relations between capital and labor and in the structure of industry to insure the workman an income adequate to the support of himself and his family.

The Episcopalians would naturally be expected to be more conservative. And yet last October the Episcopalian Church in Denver declared:

> The Church cannot advocate a particular method, but we call upon the employers in our communion to labor for the adoption of a plan or plans which shall co-ordinate production and consumption, insure continuity of employment and provide security of income to the workers of the nation. The profit-seeking motive must give way to that of service.

The New York *World-Telegram,* which collects these utterances, speaks of them as showing an "unprecedented liberal trend" in the churches. Christianity would seem to be catching up with certain of its prophets not long dead—Josiah Strong, Washington Gladden, Walter Rauschenbusch. Apparently what was long since discovered to be immoral—namely, the capitalistic system of production and distribution—is now proving to be unworkable, and the churches are getting excited. We wish they might have gotten excited before, but it is a wholesome thing to be forced into the discovery that what is ethically wrong cannot in the long run be practicable. This universe, in other words, is moral. God reigns! What violates the divine law of righteousness must in the end be destroyed.

A Declaration of Independence

We are thirty-seven years old and have spent the past fifteen years in the ministry, the first five years in the Baptist church, the last ten in the Unitarian fellowship. These are not important facts except as they bear upon a problem which we are anxious to discuss, namely, the question as to how the intelligent American in the future is to seek what we think it will be well to call wholeness, by which we mean a kind of peace and harmony within, a spiritual and intellectual integrity.

Our experience in the church (and we had essentially the same experience in the Unitarian as in the Baptist church) convinced us that organized religion in America is a hindrance rather than a help to anyone seeking what we have just called wholeness. For example, there is not a single outstanding specimen in the American pulpit today of a man who seems to have achieved this quality of spiritual independence. All of the great pulpiteers of our time appear, when closely examined, to be echoes of an environment to which they have made a more or less successful adjustment. There is a chameleon quality about every one of them. We do not say this to disparage them, for we have deep admiration for several outstanding preachers whom we might name as entering into the consideration leading one to this judgment.

What we mean to do by such a statement is not to cast reflections on any of the worthy and admirable leaders of American religion, but to point out, if we may, how impossible it is to be successful in the American pulpit unless one is voicing what has become, at least in some quarters, a habitual frame of mind, leading to ideas which bear the mark of the rubber stamp. A really original mind cannot succeed in the American pulpit. Fundamentalists succeed. Modernists succeed. Radicals succeed. But in every case the man must be the expression of a fashion in thinking, and his utterances must have at least a tinge of staleness and patness about them to meet the approval of any considerable group of followers. That is to say, every preacher, be he fundamentalist, modernist or radical, must be the voice of the people, and every *vox populi* is a follower who poses as a leader.

What is true of the preachers is true of the laity in the churches. There is something destructive to spiritual wholeness in the organized life of religion. The only way to escape it is to cut away entirely from every form of mass thinking and set up for one's self in an effort to see life steadily and see it whole.

This criticism applies not only to religion but to every other type of American organization. We have never been an eager joiner, but we confess it requires an effort for us to keep out of such organizations as Professor Dewey's "League for Independent Political Action," or any of the many other societies formed for concerted action (or concerted inaction) amongst liberal-minded people. Yet we firmly believe that what the American people have got to learn to do is to think alone, not in groups, before we come to any great degree of national maturity.

We are too much given to making membership in some society take the place of profound thinking about life, that is, life in either its personal or its social aspects. We realize now that we made a mistake, when we emerged from our orthodox upbringing, in joining the Unitarian fellowship. That simply meant that we began a process, not of developing wholeness in ourself, but a process of fitting into another mass mold, a mold which is as inelastic in its way as any organized form of life in America. We soon found out, to our everlasting regret, that we had again bartered our soul for a mess of principles, loudly proclaimed but shockingly inoperative in the lives of the group. As soon as we tried, in any profound sense, to make those principles active motivations in our own life we found ourself isolated for doing the very thing we imagined the group was formed to do. Then a conflict set up within us. We wanted to keep the good-will of the group, and we wanted at the same time to save our soul, to achieve inner harmony. We could keep the former only so long as we neglected the latter. Now most Americans, and we mean the leaders of our life especially, since they are all that count in any event—most Americans "succeed" in convincing themselves that democracy requires a certain capitulation, preferably unconsciously performed, to the group with which one most nearly finds himself in agreement. So there are few independent thinkers in America, few men and women known to the world as working out their own salvation. Every leader is looked upon, indeed looks upon himself, as trying to save others, not as trying to mature his own soul.

Our sociological dogma of the shared life has so eaten its way into our hearts that we try to share our ideas and lives before they are worth sharing, and, as a result, we degenerate into bell-cows surrounded by herds of bovine followers, who, while they may vary in breed, are all hide-bound. Thus all life in America has a doctrinaire quality about it which destroys one's development from within. This is as true of the subscribers to the *Nation* as it is of the subscribers to the *Watchman-Examiner*. It is as true of the Socialist party as it is of the Union League Club.

Hardly a soul in America dares to live his life as an individual. He must share his life. Professor Dewey, whose intellectual accomplishments are considerable, has played into the hands of American gregariousness and wolf-mindedness, by enunciating a

doctrine of the shared life which puts in liberal and pseudo-Christian phraseology what every American has always unfortunately felt, namely, that he couldn't live his life alone but had to make himself indistinguishable from some tribe with which he sought the happy hunting grounds.

America sadly needs men and women who, like Robert Frost, preach no cant, lead no movements, belong to no soul-saving or society-curing clans, but men and women who dare to live not apart from life but apart from the herd, not in ivory-towers but in honest independence, not cynically but wholesomely. We nominate Robert Frost, not because he is America's greatest poet, but because he is the kind of spiritual leader which America needs, because he cannot be followed or imitated. He lives the life of absolute spiritual integrity which makes all our silly doctrines of capitalism, socialism, communism and every other form of corporate soul-negation look like the cheap religion that it is. Whether this kind of life is lived by Robert Frost in an eighteenth century farmhouse in Vermont, or by Montaigne in the vineyards of France, it is the only kind of life that is rational, sane and worth living. It is the only life fit to share because it is whole.

RAYMOND H. PALMER.

Jottings

In the great Beer Parade in New York, sponsored and led by Mayor Walker, thousands of marchers shouted in refrain, "We want beer! We want beer!" As this chorus rent the air we realized for the first time how genuinely effective Prohibition is!

Would you believe it? Prohibition was the cause of the Lindbergh tragedy, Communism was the cause of the assassination of the French President, and Pacifism was the cause of the assassination of the Japanese Premier. This law of cause and effect is an astonishing thing.

Mesh toe stockings are now advertised in New York for summer wear with sandals. These stockings are called "Peep-toe," since there is no weaving visible over the toes—"only a sheer veiling that lets the scarlet, or green, or silver of your nails shine through." How lovely! Pedicured and painted toe-nails, to match manicured and painted finger-nails! If America, like Rome, doesn't decline and fall, it ought to.

Mayor Walker, of New York, still plays in great good luck. On the very day a taxi financier testified on oath that he had given the Mayor bonds worth $26,535 just before the city took decisive action affecting taxi control, the body of Lindbergh's baby was found and everything else disappeared from the news. But the testimony is on record, and luck has a way of turning.

A fishing schooner in New York harbor, laden with 30,000 pounds of fish, was seized by Prohibition officers because she also contained 1,000 cases of whiskey. The fish, an embarrassment to the officers, was given away to the poor at a festive distribution advertised over the radio. Here is a precedent! Why should not all surplus food be given away in this fashion?

Great Britain has protested against the expenditures of the League of Nations. Yet Britain's own military expenditures are *eighty times* the whole cost of the League. Millions for war, but only a few pennies for peace!

J. H. H.

So Shall It Be

So shall it be as always it has been
That flesh of man returns unto the earth
Which yields the fuel that keeps the fire alive
And takes man's ashes back into its womb.
Whither the seed first rooted in the soil
Anew it bursts a flower in the Spring
And lives the summer through in warmth and peace
To fade with Autumn colors on the hill.
Thus has the soul of man one life to live.
If it be blighted yet before its time
(And die when shoots grow green upon the bough
Never to know soft summer with its winds
Tender and soothing to the ripening fruit,
Nor yet the crisp sharp colors of the Fall)
Why should we weep for fate, who is the king
Of destiny—or brood as youth departs?
For one, I am content that I have lived
And would not have man sorrow when I go.
If life be short—yet full—I rest in peace
Knowing that it will end with nothing more.
Thus I return deep in the earth I love
(Where I—a little child—have lain and dreamed)
To leave my footprints on the warm brown sod
In silence that waits ever on the grave.
Having walked with nature in my heart
Wild winds shall blow my ashes where they may.
For peace is mine watching the colors fade.
Mourn not death's sleep, and be you unafraid
To meet the passing seasons year by year.
You may live on to know the dying Fall
Seeing things from afar with tired eyes;
But I depart while yet my eyes may shine
With joy in life for beauty of mankind.

CAROLINE PARKER SMITH

In Defense of Freedom*

II

We do not need to share their belief in the necessity of revolution in America to insist that if Communists believe it sincerely they should be allowed to express their fears and convictions. It then becomes the duty of those who think the Communists are wrong to oppose their doctrines before the bar of public opinion. This is the basis on which our Government was founded and on which it endures. If we turn our backs on freedom of speech, we put an end to democracy.

America already has more than enough laws to combat anarchy and violence. Section six of the criminal code of the United States provides that "if two or more persons in any state conspire to overthrow the government of the United States, they can be fined $5,000 or imprisoned not more than six years, or both." The courts have held that an actual overt act is not necessary to convict for seditious conspiracy. Other laws make it illegal to circulate through the mails anything which advocates "treason, insurrection, or forcible resistance to law." We already have a law providing for the exclusion and deportation after entry into the United States of aliens who believe in, or advise, advocate, or teach the overthrow of the Government of the United States, or who advocate violence.

The recent Fish Committee fiasco is a complete refutation of the need for more laws. It will be remembered that it was appointed largely because Police Commissioner Whalen of New York City was credulous enough to believe in certain forged documents implicating the Communists in revolutionary plans. After investigation the Committee itself found "that the testimony failed to establish the genuineness of the so-called Whalen documents." It further shows that in the last presidential election the total Communist vote amounted to only 36,000, and in the last state elections of 1930 the total vote was only 82,000, although we were in a period of the most severe depression in forty years, with millions out of work. It will be seen that these numbers are negligible when compared with the 122,000,000 of our population. As a matter of fact, thousands who voted the Communist ticket did not believe in its principles. Some workers with whom the writer talked said that they voted Communist as a protest against the ridiculousness of the Fish investigation itself. The Committee admits that there are less than 12,000 dues-paying Communist members in the entire United States, even today, and Moscow reports that there are only 8,000. While Mr. Fish may say that those who pay dues do not represent the entire strength of Communism, it is absurd to suppose that a man would be willing to fight for a movement which he was unwilling to join.

Thus the Committee appointed to study the "red" danger proved that there was none. Actually the Communists in America are destroying their own party. Give them rope and they will hang themselves. They are already hopelessly split into Stalin and Trotsky factions. Each side spends far more time in opposing the other than in opposing the capitalists. They expel their Scott Nearings and retain their morons.

A distinguished American jurist, John Bassett Moore, formerly of the World Court, correctly states the case when he says:

> In the United States there are comparatively few who may be said to have no individual interest in maintaining the system under which we have lived and prospered, yet there are those among us today who are suddenly affrighted by the very mention of the word communist. I do not share this feeling of alarm and most certainly do not share it to the extent of believing that it is advisable to make new laws further to curtail freedom of thinking or suppress freedom of speech. I was born in the belief and was taught in childhood, that in the free exchange of opinions and the calm discussion of issues, the truth would emerge and survive, and I still cherish that faith today.
>
> There is, in my opinion, no better way to nourish and diffuse erroneous opinions than to persecute and advertise them.

The real method for preventing Communism is to permit absolute freedom to every sincere individual to express any grievance, real or fancied.

Mr. Masaryk, now President of the Czecho-Slovak Republic, knows Communism and Russia. During the World War he was commanding troops in the heart of Communistic Russia. Surely in this case, if anywhere, it was dangerous to permit free agitation. The Communist leaders approached Mr. Masaryk and asked permission to propagandize his troops. Instead of adopting the methods of repression, Mr. Masaryk gave them full permission to agitate up and down the Czecho-Slovak ranks. At the end of the seven-day period Mr. Masaryk thanked the agitators very warmly for their efforts and allowed them to take away the handful of converts they had made—with the result that he had an even better army than before. This is using social intelligence. Today we find the Czecho-Slovak Republic permitting a Communist Party.

The peculiar malady afflicting reactionaries, which makes its victims persecute in the name of patriotism, is a psychosis usually called the "red phobia." It is something like the sport of killing mosquitoes: it is so much easier to swear at them than it is to study scientifically the causes which produced them. Fortunately, the chief causes of Bolshevism are now well-known to have been the terrible injustices under the Tsar. Our country is not menaced by the threat of Communism, but by unemployment, economic injustice, and poverty. These are the conditions against which we should fight, rather than to curb freedom of speech.

To prevent Communism in the United States, we must remove the injustice which produces it. Mr. Zinovieff, former head of the Communist Internationale, and Mr. Stalin, head of the Communist Government, have united in stating that it is impossible to propagate Communism except where there is widespread injustice. They reported that a Communist agitator could be sent into a factory where conditions were reasonably good and wages high, and he could work until blue in the face and not secure a single convert. The sane, intelligent method of combatting Communism is, therefore, to eliminate injustice wherever it is found.

Freedom of speech, even the advocacy of revolution, is a safety-valve. Let hot air and steam escape and there is no explosion. Close the vent of public discussion, outlaw the Communist Party, and you dam up resentment which may cause death and destruction at any moment. Free speech is to the people what fresh

*The first part of this article was published in last week's issue.—Editor.

air is to the tuberculosis patient: its tonic and strengthening effect in the end destroys the germs of disease. Stop free speech and the danger grows ominous. If a doctor should prevent an ulcer from discharging on the surface, he would but spread the deadly poison throughout the patient's system. It is the same with the denial of free speech, even if it be poisonous. It is proposed to outlaw Communism as a political party. This would force its supporters to recognize that for them political action was impossible and violence the sole remedy. Communism would be driven underground into secret conspiracy. In secret the dangers of violence would be far greater than if it could be dealt with openly by counter-propaganda. No nation can permanently endure without free trade in ideas. Drive a political party underground, and explosions of violence and bloodshed will inevitably follow.

Still more important, however, is the fact that any suppression of the Communist Party would throw restrictions around hundreds of sincere and patriotic American organizations. Already the societies and organizations opposing the Communists are attacking others. The Fish Committee attacks the American Civil Liberties Union. The chairman of this organization is Dr. Harry Ward of Union Theological Seminary, whom Dr. John Haynes Holmes declares to be among the seven greatest clergymen in the United States. Only recently, in Memphis, Tennessee, a respectable college text-book salesman of the Houghton Mifflin Company was confined in jail for two days because he inquired at police headquarters as to whether there was a Communist organization in the community. Instead of being a Communist, he proved to be the grandson of the first Governor of Tennessee and a graduate of the University of North Carolina. The acting mayor defended the arrest by saying that police policy "is to question any persons who evidence leanings toward Communism." The record of all attacks on radicals proves that the term "Communist" is not applied simply to those who are affiliated with the Communist Internationale. The term is warped and broadened to include some of the highest citizens of our republic. Wherever you find a vested interest threatened by loss of revenue through radicalism, there is a tendency to charge those responsible with Communism.

Denial of freedom of speech and repression always result in breeding professional agitators, who threaten those who differ with them. For example, in recent years any one who dares to advocate relationship with the Russian Government, no matter how slight, stands in danger of being called a Communist; and if his arguments are effective and he comes from an institution of learning, the attempt is made secretly to bring pressure to jeopardize his position. Not very long ago President Hopkins of Dartmouth College, in an address at Chicago, stated that he believed that "truth has nothing to fear from error, if truth be untrammeled at all times and if error be denied the sanctity conferred upon it by persecution or concealment." He declared that if Lenin or Trotsky were available he would "be glad to have the students hear them and to have them form their judgment as to the dangers or merits of Bolshevism on the basis of direct evidence, rather than through the inconsistent and contradictory pronouncements of anti-Bolshevist propaganda." The director of the American Defense Society retorted to the effect that "such remarks could well have been inspired in Moscow and are in strict accord with the well-matured plans of those who would overthrow the government by violence." Because the president of Dartmouth sincerely sought to search for truth, the American Defense Society then sent out letters asking their recipients to bring pressure to bear on the board of trustees to oust Mr. Hopkins from the presidency. When an organization of such standing, claiming to be patriotic, and in defense of America, takes such an attitude toward a president of one of our best colleges, a loyal and patriotic American, we can realize the almost unbelievable pressure brought to bear on the average man. If such a policy is persisted in much longer, the result may be as Senator Borah predicted when charged with radicalism: "It may come to this, that a radical must be defined as one who still believes in the Constitution of the United States."

Even more recently, note the attack on Mr. Mencken, chairman of the Board of National Security League, an organization which since its inception has worked night and day to oppose radicalism in every form. He was rash enough to go to Soviet Russia last year and when he returned he had the courage to reverse his previous opinion about that country. As a result he states in a personal letter to the writer that many of his former comrades not only call him un-American, but charge that he has "gone Communist."

In a recent issue of *Collier's Weekly,* a gentleman from Florida charges that because this periodical has dared to print the life of Senator Boies Penrose, who was one of our great statesmen, they may therefore be "in the pay of Red Russia, like others." This is precisely the kind of nonsense which will be promoted by a campaign of repression against those who are radicals. It may start by opposition to those who really do dream of some future day when there may be a revolution in the United States; it will end in a repressive movement against any citizen who may dare to make proposals contrary to the vested interests.

It is notorious that in almost every strike situation the workers are charged with Communism. This was true in the United States steel strike, when the workers were struggling against the twelve-hour day, even though the President of the United States favored the shorter day. It was true a century ago, when the workers were striking for the ten-hour day. Debar Communists and you place in greater danger every sincere and patriotic citizen who is fighting for an unpopular cause.

Some say that at any rate we should restore to the Department of Justice the funds which would enable them to spy on radicals and Communists. "It can do no harm to have the facts," is their thesis. Unfortunately, it is the history of secret service departments that they use wrong methods. Shall we in our turn create an American spy agency, and in peace time? Note its dangers from our experience. Immediately following the War, the Department of Justice did have such funds at its disposal. The result is carefully appraised in a report entitled, "The Illegal Practices of the United States Department of Justice," signed by twelve distinguished lawyers, among whom are Professors Chaffee and Frankfurter of the Harvard Law School and Dean Roscoe Pound, appointed by President Hoover to the Wickersham Committee and also

strongly recommended as United States representative on the World Court. These gentlemen say:

> Under the guise of a campaign for the suppression of radical activities, the office of the Attorney General, acting by its local agents throughout the country, and giving express instructions from Washington, has committed continual illegal acts. Wholesale arrests both of aliens and of citizens have been made without warrant or any process of law; men and women have been jailed and held *incommunicado* without access of friends or counsel; homes have been entered without search-warrant and property seized and removed; other property has been wantonly destroyed; workingmen and workingwomen suspected of radical views have been shamefully abused and maltreated.

Because he believed the methods used were illegal, Francis Fisher Kane resigned as United States District Attorney, while Judge Thompson of Pittsburgh, according to the press, made the following comment on the case of a Russian brought to trial before him:

> This case makes my blood boil. The methods of the Department of Justice have created more anarchy than all the radical parties put together, and conditions in this district are worse than they were in Russia. I did not suppose this kind of thing could happen in a country where we had a constitution.

In his study Panunzio corroborated the conclusions found in the report signed by Dean Pound. He states that not even an administrative hearing was given in some cases until weeks after the Russians were imprisoned. In the hearings the immigrant inspector acted as prosecutor, judge, and jury at the same time. "In some instances the very men who originally had caused the arrest of the alien acted as interpreter at the hearing." In 1922 Senator Walsh, a Democrat, a member of the Sub-committee on the Judiciary of the United States Senate, brought in a report substantiating these charges against the Department of Justice under a Democratic administration. Charles E. Hughes, now Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, has declared that the methods used "savor of the worst practices of tyranny."

The methods used in arresting and deporting can be better understood by a concrete example. Theodore Concevich, head of the Church of All Nations in New York City, says:

> Joseph Polulech is a young Russian, twenty-five years old. He was in America eight years. He was a member of the church and I was his pastor. He is a bright young man, eager to learn. He was attending a night school run by the Communist Party. He was studying English and algebra. He was not a Communist, but he was made an officer in the school because of his faithfulness and intelligence. On the night that the school was raided by the Lusk Committee, everybody present was arrested, Joseph Polulech among them. I and others protested to the Lusk Committee and gave our guarantee that young Polulech was not a Communist. We received no reply to our protest. Joseph Polulech is now among two hundred and forty-nine aliens who are locked up in cars being pushed over the Finnish frontier.

Mr. Concevich added: "Russians are now afraid to attend public meetings and classes for fear of having the police raid their meeting places and 'beat them up.'"

All history teaches us the wisdom of freedom, the dangers of suppression. Yet how quickly we forget its lessons! It was but yesterday that the world-renowned Bismarck of Germany was attempting to use these same repressive measures. Those who advocated revolution were imprisoned. Kaiser Wilhelm continued this same policy, and it was for the avowed purpose of making the world safe for democracy that the United States entered the world conflict. Repressive laws enacted by Germany, instead of preventing a cataclysm, promoted it.

Today, under a Japanese Emperor, we find Japan outlawing Communism. Yet the former head of the Japanese secret service, a distinguished diplomat, has said that it has but driven the movement underground, making it far more difficult to combat.

Of all the nations in the world, Great Britain has perhaps been most free from internal political revolution. Eighteenth century England was blessed with liberty just because the people had forced the Government to give them freedom. It persists to this day. In Hyde Park in London the writer listened to a speech by a Communist, in which he advocated the violent overthrow of the British Government. Some among the listeners began to move forward as if to seize the agitator and do him harm, but an English policeman, as a representative of the English crown, stepped forward saying: "Give the man a chance; he has a right to have his say." The result is that in England Communism is a ridiculous and pathetic minority, in spite of unemployment and depression; it nowhere commands the allegiance of the masses.

America dare not travel the road of Germany or Japan. Suspicion, suppression, and class hatred do not make up the soil from which freedom springs. The only pathway to beauty and happiness is the road of equality for all, of liberty for every minority to have its say and win its way, if it can.

Every citizen must realize that liberty comes only through action, not abstractions. Every limitation of freedom for a minority is to some degree a denial of liberty to all.

Shall America go forward to win freedom for all, or shall we continue proudly to proclaim that its rights are inalienable for all the people while unconsciously we practise denial of freedom in the name of liberty?

JEROME DAVIS.
Yale University, New Haven, Conn.

The "Firm Hand" in India

[From Our Special Correspondent]

Among my most vivid memories of India is the *hartal* on May 5th, 1930. A *hartal* is a kind of general strike that includes every section of the population; and on this day mills, factories, shops and markets stood deserted all over India in protest against the arrest of Mahatma Gandhi.

I was living at the time at Gandhi's *Ashram* near Ahmedabad where the authorities had shown more sense than was usual in dealing with the Civil Disobedience Movement. Instead of aggressively displaying the police and troops at his disposal, the magistrate there had been in the habit of leaving the work of "law and order" to the Congress "Volunteers." Entirely unarmed, these soldiers of Gandhi would parade the streets in their uniforms of hand-spun and hand-woven cotton. Everyone respected them and obeyed their courteous requests without hesitation. A few of these volunteers would maintain perfect order and dis-

cipline among the thousands who thronged the streets to honour Gandhi or some other Congress leader. No crowds that I have ever seen can compare with their numbers, their enthusiasm or their discipline.

In one respect the crowd I met in Ahmedabad that May morning was an exception. During nine months that I spent travelling in India at a time of political excitement and activity unsurpassed even in the present year, I only once saw a crowd getting "out of hand." I had driven in to the city with two of the local Congress leaders. In that growing centre of the cotton industry not a single factory chimney was smoking and not a shop was to be seen open. Everything was just as it had been on an earlier occasion when Jawaharlal Nehru (the Socialist leader of "Young India") was arrested. Then suddenly as we came round a corner we met a large and excited crowd that blocked the road and brought our car to a standstill. It was the only Indian crowd I ever saw that could conceivably have been described as a "mob."

The explanation was illuminating. We were informed that two armored cars had just gone by with machine guns. Also that the military were in the town. The situation was certainly disquieting, for the Ahmedabad mill-hands have not the patience of the peasants when provoked; and we foresaw a riot.

At our destination (a newspaper office) a note was waiting for the two Congress leaders. The magistrate urgently requested their presence at his house. They went there immediately and found him much agitated. Under the circumstances, he said, he had no alternative to patrolling the town with armored cars. My friends, however, assured him that this was the surest way to provoke trouble, and added that if he would agree to keep his armored cars, armed police and soldiers out of the way and close all the liquor shops for 24 hours, *they* would be responsible for the peace of the city. This the magistrate at last agreed to, and as a result peace continued to reign in Ahmedabad. Wherever the same plan was adopted it had the same result; but such was the arrogance (or possibly the terror) of the officials that it was too seldom tried.

My experience was by no means unique. It was just a dramatic manifestation of the solidarity of the Indian masses in their support of Mahatma Gandhi and the Congress, and their respect for Congress organization and methods. It also demonstrated the futility of pretending that order is kept by the government and its forces when in point of fact order is kept by an "illegal association" which wages a remarkably successful war on disorder as represented by both Indian terrorists and the Government's police. The reality of this triumph of moral force was recorded in 1930 by Mr. Brailsford, a critical and remarkably unbiased observer. Several American witnesses have expressed themselves to the same effect. Those who attended the meetings addressed recently in London by M. Edmond Privat (a professor of Geneva University, recently returned from India) must all have felt that this same fact had impressed itself deeply on his mind also in the present struggle.

Bearing in mind my own experiences of 1930 I find more difficulty than most people appear to in accepting Government communiqués and explanations. Leaving aside for the moment the vexed question of official statements regarding firing or *lathi* charges that so completely contradict the unanimous testimony of non-official Indians, I would cite the following as an example of a statement that seriously taxes my faith. It is the official reply given by Mr. Young in the Legislative Assembly on February 22nd, in answer to a question:

> Route marches are part of ordinary training. Extensive use of them has been made recently, as apart from their value for purposes of training they encourage friendly contact between the civil population and the military, while the display of troops has a steadying influence and tends to restore confidence in times of unrest.

Unfortunately the "steadying influence" does not end here. According to the last official figures there are 29,000 people in jail in connection with the Civil Disobedience Movement, out of whom nearly 1,500 (of those imprisoned up to the end of February) were women—the present figure is probably considerably larger. The last official figures of "detenus" and other persons kept in custody during the Government's pleasure show that there are about 1,000 people in jail without trial or charge stated against them. The various ordinances provide for every imaginable tyranny including the confiscation of property without appeal to the courts and the hearing of capital charges by secret tribunals of three, where a majority verdict can condemn a man to death in his absence. *Lathi* charges, in which serious injuries and even deaths occur, are a daily affair. Official communiqués (about two a week on the average) report firing by the police on "mobs," with the stock excuse that stones were thrown. Under the ordinances photographs and accounts of such incidents are not allowed to be published in the papers. Many of my own letters (if sent to me direct) have clearly been opened in the post, and I can only guess at the proportion that never reach me. And in addition to these, the demonstrable tyrannies of "Law and Order" that even the Government cannot deny, we have the terrible accusations made by such men as Dr. Paton, Peter Freeman, Professor Edmond Privat, Father Elwin and Christopher Ackroyd (former Professor of History at St. Paul's College, Calcutta). These men, four of them British and the fifth a distinguished European, have between them corroborated the worst accusations against the Government and its servants from personal experience of police methods of which they have been witness. Their statements have been published and the attention of the Government drawn to them. Yet with the single exception of the Paton case, where a tardy apology from the Government was forthcoming, Whitehall has remained unmoved. For the Indian peasant or laborer, who has not the advantages of a white skin and a brother-in-law in the House of Commons, there remains no redress in British justice.

And yet every letter I receive from India rings with the same hope and certainty and indomitable courage—the unconquerable spirit of a nation newly come into being. The two-fold plea of the Government —that the "firm hand" is necessary and that things are steadily "improving"—is utterly indefensible. On the other hand it is increasingly clear that Congress alone can establish any real order in India, and that it can do so *without* resorting to methods which have reduced the function of Government to the moral level of highway robbery. The "Firm Hand" is simply the frenzied clutch of a drowning man.

REGINALD A. REYNOLDS.

London, England.

British Police Violate French Sovereign Rights in French India

During the eighteenth century the French and the English fought many battles in India to establish a colonial empire. The French were defeated and the British established their supremacy in India. However, a few small French possessions are still left in India; and the French are generally very jealous to maintain their sovereign rights and the rights of their citizens. But for some peculiar reason the French authorities of Chandernagor, a city situated near Calcutta, did not take any steps to uphold French sovereignty on the occasion when a British Police Commissioner of Calcutta, Sir Charles Tegart, with a party, in violation of French laws, French sovereignty and even British law, entered the French city and killed some Indian nationalists and arrested some, without any sanction from the British or French authorities. The injured party has tried to secure redress from the French and British authorities for the loss, and demanded punishment of British officials who acted as common bandits and violated the sovereign rights of France, but so far the French authorities in India, in France and British authorities in India, British courts in India and the British Government in Great Britain have not taken any action on this serious case, which involves violation of fundamental principles of International Law and even municipal laws.

From the materials supplied to me by a responsible Advocate of Calcutta High Court, J. C. Banerjee, the story of the case is as follows:

British Police authorities of Calcutta had the suspicion that some of the Indian Nationalists, who had been charged with "waging war" against His Majesty's Government in India, were living in Chandernagor, as "political refugees." According to the established principles of International Law and also according to the existing treaties between Great Britain and France (vide Anglo-French Treaty of 1815 and that of 1876) and according to the Bengal Government Circular on Extradition of Political Offenders (vide Act XV of 1903 of India and British Foreign Jurisdiction, Act of 1890) these Indian nationalists could not be extradited, because they were "political offenders" and not ordinary criminals. On September 2nd, 1930, at about 2:45 A. M. (in the dead of night) a large Police Party from Calcutta armed with revolvers and other deadly weapons, headed by Sir Charles Tegart, the then commissioner of Police of Calcutta, reached French Chandernagor in motor cars and suddenly surrounded the house of Mr. Sasadhar Acharya and his sub-tenants and several other neighboring houses in a populous quarter of the French town. Just at their approach, the British Police Party threw flash-lights into the apartments of Mr. Acharya's house and other neighboring houses and terrorized the occupants by unprovoked firing, the marks of bullets still existing on the houses testifying to the recklessness with which the raid was conducted. The Police Party not only trespassed into the premises of Mr. Sasahdahar Acharya and Mrs. Suhasini Devi, in contravention of the French Law of the locality and the English Law (to which British officers were liable) and the Indian Law (to which Indian officers were amenable under section 4 of Indian Penal Code) but mercilessly assaulted the inmates of the house, causing serious fractures and injuries to many and *killed one person whose dead body with several bullet wounds was later on found in a neighboring tank by the French police.* The British Police Party also arrested, without any authority or sanction from the French police, various persons and took them to Calcutta.

Mr. Jitendra Chandra Banerjee, M. A., B. L., an Advocate of the High Court of Calcutta, tried to secure the release of his clients, Mr. Acharya and Mrs. Suhashini Devi, on the ground that they were illegally detained, in violation of laws. Advocate Banerjee personally petitioned to the French Governor of the French Indian Settlements at Pondicherry demanding release of Mr. Acharya and for the prosecution of the French and British officers for the illegal acts and also for forwarding the petition to the higher authorities in France, and through them to the Permanent Court of International Justice at the Hague. The Governor assured enquiry and action thereupon, and through his good offices unconditional release of Mr. Acharya was secured.

Advocate Banerjee, on behalf of Mr. Acharya and Mrs. Suhashini Devi, brought suits against Sir Charles Tegart and others before the High Court of Calcutta, charging them with murder and other illegal acts. The High Court of Calcutta had jurisdiction over the case and the case was heard before the Honorable Judges when the Attorney General for the Government of Bengal contended that Sir Charles Tegart, the Police Commissioner of Calcutta and other High Police Officers, according to the existing laws, could not be prosecuted by any court without the sanction of the Government of Bengal even if they acted illegally; and the judges upheld the contention, although they freely admitted that Sir Charles Tegart and others violated French, British and Indian Laws. The honorable judges suggested that it would be the business of the French authorities to take action against those who have violated the French Extradition Laws and French Penal Code and committed a murder on French soil. Advocate Banerjee has approached the French authorities to take action, but without success. Mr. Banerjee writes:

> The French authorities of Chandarnagor and of Pondicherry are also obstructive. I have already moved the President of the French Republic and the French Minister of Foreign Affairs, and all papers have been forwarded to them with the prayers that they will arrange for fixing a date for discussion of this matter in their Chamber and Senate and to refer the matter to the International Court of Arbitration at The Hague. I have also sent similar applications to the Hon. Speaker of the House of British Parliament and the Prime Minister, Mr. Ramsay MacDonald, Mr. Wedgwood Benn, the Secretary of State for India and Mr. Fenner Brockway, M. P. . . . I forwarded a copy of the petition to the President of the French Republic and the Minister of Foreign Affairs on the 13th of May, 1931. . . .

The case against Sir Charles Tegart and others involve the following legal points: 1. Sir Charles did not even secure warrants from British authorities against the persons who were living as refugees in Chandernagor, before he and his party committed the raid. 2. The British authorities did not apply for any extradition to the French authorities, before committing the raid. 3. The raid was committed at certain hours of the night when according to the French law in Chandernagor, no French police even can enter the apartments of any resident. 4. The raid was conducted without the knowledge of the French authorities and

there were no French officials in company with the raiding party. 5. During the illegal raid some persons were wounded and one man was killed by the police party.

It seems that the French authorities are unwilling to take action against these British officials. But suppose that a group of Italian Police officials without the permission of the French officials entered a French city and trespassed into French homes, assaulted inmates, killed some persons, arrested some Italian political refugees and brought them to an Italian city, without the sanction of the French authorities (even without asking for extradition) and placed them in an Italian jail, then there would have been a serious international situation. The British authorities have violated French sovereignty, French laws and all principles of International Law, but no action has been taken by the French, is it because the injured party, immediately concerned, are Indians and Asiatics? Is it because there is a definite and decisive practice of double standards of international morality in the cases involving violations of International Law—one for Europeans and one for Asiatics?

The case may seem simple, but it has a very far-reaching meaning for those who believe in single standards of international morality and justice. Will the French Society of Rights of Men and other lovers of human liberty and international law in all countries take notice of the facts involved in the case and take the necessary steps so that the violators of International law, be they British officials, be tried before the Permanent Court of International Justice at the Hague?

TARAKNATH DAS.

Baden-Baden, Germany.

The Study Table

Manchuria

Of course Kawakami's "Japan Speaks"[1] is a partisan presentation. It appears simultaneously with "China Speaks," by a Chinese writer, presenting the other side of the Sino-Japanese crisis. Probably in part due to its controversial nature, partly due to haste in its preparation, the book is far from Mr. Kawakami's best writing. He claims that the book is inspired by an editorial article in the New York *Times,* in which Japan is said to have lacked "good publicity" in her present difficulties. This tempts to a digression. We in America understand, or think we understand the Chinese much better than we do the Japanese. It is true: it will always be true. It is part of the same psychology which leads us to say that the Chinese is the "better business man," that "he understands a contract and will stick by it." The fact that Chinese learn English more readily and better than the Japanese do, is part of the same thing. If one is really to learn English, he should practice its use on every occasion. The Chinese do so, regardless of blunders; the Japanese is so sensitive that he will not practice it, for fear of making mistakes. So in matters of policy and procedure, the Japanese, sure that he is right, is too proud to explain or defend his position. He assumes that his actions justify themselves. All of which is unfortunate and gives basis for the *Times* editorial. Let us close this digression by warning that our comprehension and understanding of the Chinese is but skindeep. We are soon beyond our depth in dealing with him. Returning to Kawakami's book, it is divided into three parts—*The background, Manchuria the issue* and *Shanghai and other problems.* In his discussion of Manchuria our author is on firm ground. Manchuria is Japan's hope, her bulwark. Raw materials, business opportunities, preparation against future danger—these are things of prime importance. The intervention was to safeguard property, to save lives, to insist upon treaty observance, to secure a government which can and will carry out its pledges. There is little new in Kawakami's presentation, so we need not consider it in detail. He omits some points of significance. Why? It would have been natural, in its place, to have mentioned the Anglo-Japanese alliance, for years the cornerstone of Japan's foreign prophecy; he makes no reference to it. Nor does he consider Knox's scheme of neutralizing the Manchurian railways; yet to have done so would have illuminated the matter of paralleling lines and given helpful light upon Russian and Japanese interests. Japan wastes time in trying to get Chinese admission of the validity of the treaty of 1915. The treaty exists; it has been signed by both parties; it holds and *should* hold. If China desires modification, her procedure is clear. Unilateral abrogation gets nowhere. Even if time and much patience are necessary for modification or abrogation, it is worth while to give the time and patience. Japan too suffered long under unequal treaties. She rid herself of them in sane and reasonable ways. Your reviewer feels that Japan has done an international service in Manchuria. He is not sure that she can maintain it. Out of a population of perhaps 35,000,000 in Manchuria, 30,000,000 are Chinese; perhaps 3,000,000 are Manchus; less than 2,000,000 are Japanese and Koreans. These Chinese are Chinese-conscious, Chinese-minded; they are probably not Nanking-minded, nor Canton-minded. The Manchurian Government should be independent, Chinese, and non-democratic. The ruler should be a Chinese. It is doubtful whether Henry Pu-Yi, Manchu, will meet the need or can be sustained. For the Japanese intervention in Shanghai, two chief reasons are offered—protection of life and property, and the desire to stop the government-instigated, government-encouraged boycott. It has precedent behind it. In 1927 Britain intervened in Shanghai. It is a pity that she did not finish the job. She was prevented from doing so by uncertainty as to the United States and Japan. At the moment we insisted on pursuing an independent policy; Japan was apparently friendly but would she permit a sister Asiatic nation to be dealt with harshly? Kawakami regrets the Shanghai adventure. He says: "Whatever the official explanation, whatever the extenuating circumstances, Japan's single-handed intervention in the Shanghai area is a blunder of the first magnitude." This is not to deny the bases for intervention. It is rather to raise the question whether Japan was wise in fighting the battle for all foreign interests *alone,* thereby being the only one to draw Chinese hatred and giving her trade competitors the advantages in trade which she lost.

1. "Japan Speaks on the Sino-Japanese Crisis. K. K. Kawakami. New York: 1932. The Macmillan Co. 16mo. pp. xvi, 184. Price $1.50.

Lattimore's book[2] was written before Japanese intervention. It is a serious scholarly study of Manchurian conditions, particularly of the colonization and migration existing there. It gives the background for the present situation and anyone who wishes to understand the seriousness of the problems which Japan, rather lightly, has assumed should read the book. Manchuria is beyond "the great wall," which means that it was occupied by semi-nomadic Tatars, whom China desired at all cost to hold at a distance. About the middle of the seventeenth century, the Manchus went beyond the wall, conquered China and established themselves as rulers at Peking. They remained in power for more than two hundred and fifty years, but were dethroned by the revolution of 1911. During their rule, they did not encourage the migration of Chinese into their home-land. It was maintained as a buffer state to hold back the northern barbarians and to supply military forces for use in Peking when necessary. Lattimore uses the term "reservoir" for the area occupied by this population. While they were "military," they were not soldiers maintained in barracks. They were encouraged and expected to largely take care of themselves—settling as agriculturists, although receiving a subvention from the Imperial government and being expected to keep in training. While at first Manchus only, toward the end of the dynasty, Chinese trickled in and were tolerated provided they settled, worked, and drilled. The soldier-farmers were organized into the "eight banners" like the troops in Peking, but the Manchus and Chinese were in separate fighting groups. The Manchus in the "reservoir" largely lost their own language and adopted Chinese culture. This force protected China against attack from the Mongols on the west and the various tribes of "northern barbarians," including the Russians. Apart from this long-settled population of the "reservoir," there has been for the last thirty or forty years an enormous migration into Manchuria, largely from Shantung. Directly and indirectly this migration has been due to railroads and other forms of westernization. Our author emphasizes the difference in character between this and the pioneering in our own West. It is not a push outward. These immigrants are not trying to get away from their fellowmen; they like to move, settle, develop in a group. Much of the migration is seasoned, the workers returning home, when the harvest is gathered. The lands where they settle are already owned by someone. Squatters soon have to deal with a landlord. The settlers are but one element in a network of inter-related interests—settler, landlord (often an official), land company, agricultural company, elevator, mill, transportation company. When the produce of the settler's toil is distributed, only a small profit remains in his hands. A most interesting type of migrant is the opium-farmer. Beyond easy transportation, on the fringe outside of the older settled regions, is an area where the only crop comes from the opium poppy. It is the only crop that will pay in its region. As the country opens up, and transportation enters, the opium farms give way to other forms of agriculture and the opium-farmer treks to the new fringe. Interesting also are the bandits. The gangs are well known and definitely located. Our author traces the origin, sources of supply, and relation to honest settlers. All of these populations—the military in the reservoir, the ordinary agricultural worker, the opium farmers, even the bandits, form for China a dike against the West and the North, but their face is turned southward, their interest is beyond the wall. They are not expansive settlers. In this district of movement and rapid development three cultures face each other—the Western culture of Japan, the semi-Western, characteristic culture of Russia and the old and conservative culture of China. The railroads, the port improvements, the other Western elements threaten. China does not consider Japan an oriental nation; she looks upon her as a renegade, who deserves no sympathy. As a Western nation, Japan is hated with the same intensity and for the same reasons as the Western nations of white men. Russia is in a different category. Russians are lumped with the other "northern barbarians." Suspected, distrusted, they arouse a totally different feeling from that held toward Japanese and Englishmen. Such is the problem. China seems still to feel that she will be able to drive the enemy that comes by water back into the sea; that she can resist Russians as she has so long resisted Mongols and other barbarians.

FREDERICK STARR.

2. "Manchuria: Cradle of Conflict." Owen Lattimore. New York: 1932. The Macmillan Co. 8vo. pp. xvi, 311. Price $3.00.

Correspondence

Disarmament and Budgets

Editor of UNITY:

Whenever I read about the strenuous efforts our government is making to cut down expenses I wonder about that huge item of $700,000,000 for national defense which, according to President Hoover, is the absolute minimum we must spend on our army and navy to insure our safety. That's pretty nearly $7 a year for each man, woman and child in the entire country, and many of us who, in a more prosperous past have contracted the habit of eating three meals a day but are now wondering how these meals are to be obtained in the future, are inclined to look with longing eyes on this fat item in the budget and to figure out how much food it would buy for the hungry.

Seven hundred million dollars does seem like a lot of money to be spending every year to keep some wicked foreigners from running away with our treasure. If we hadn't signed that Kellogg Peace Pact and promised never to go on the war path again, it wouldn't be so hard to understand, because we all know it takes a pile of money to run a first class up-to-date war, but it does seem as if we could manage to pare off a couple of hundred million if we have no designs on our neighbors and merely wish to insure our safety from invasion.

And I do wish the government would let us know what nations are so rapacious that they are ready to spring at our throats the moment our annual appropriation for defense sinks below the $700,000,000 level. How stupid they must be, whoever they are, not to have attacked us long ago, back in the eighties of the last century, for instance, when we had an army of 20,000 men armed with rifles of an ancient vintage and a few cannon, relics of the civil war, nosing their black muzzles over the ramparts of some picturesque old sea-side forts, a navy of romantic looking wooden ships, and an annual military budget so small that it would hardly pay for one little junket of leather-necks to Nicaragua or Haiti. Yet we seemed to worry along very nicely in those days without the trappings of war and slept soundly enough at night without harassing dreams of invaders at our gates.

"Nobody wants war." We hear this sentiment expressed so often that we accept it as an axiom. But is it true? I doubt it. On the contrary, lots of people want war. Every professional soldier, deep down in his heart, can not help but welcome it. It gives him his only chance to justify his right to live at the expense of the tax-payer. It would be just about as reasonable to expect a soldier

to wish for a world without war as to expect a convention of undertakers to vote to abolish funerals.

How about the armament manufacturers, the makers of ammunition, explosives, and all the paraphernalia of destruction? In time of war they begin to rake in the dividends. Is it reasonable to suppose that they are longing for the abolishment of an institution from which they derive profit?

These two groups, the professional militarists and the armament makers, have a direct interest in fostering the military spirit, preparedness, nationalism, etc., and use such groups as the Navy League, the D. A. R. and the National Security League to further their interests by means of propaganda and lobbying.

However, apart from these two groups that really have some reasonable excuse for not abhorring war, there are thousands of good citizens who look back to war times as the good times when profits were fat and there was a zest to life. They are the ones that set their faces sternly and talked about "carrying on." They were exalted with the spirit of sacrifice (other people's sacrifice); their sense of importance was flattered by serving on all sorts of committees; perhaps they could even strut about in uniform as members of the home guard. They made fine speeches and were thrilled with the wild applause of their audience when they pledged the last drop of blood and the last dollar in the treasury to insure victory. Life was exciting. It was so interesting to read about "offensives," "air raids," "trench raids" or what not in the morning paper while seated comfortably before a dainty breakfast in a warm cozy room. It added zest to life to "give till it hurts," knowing all the time that for every thousand you subscribed to Liberty Loans at three per cent, you were probably getting back two in increased profits and enhanced value of your stock of merchandise. Yes, business was good, life was exciting, and you had the comfortable feeling that you were making all kinds of sacrifices like giving up sugar in your coffee and walking to the office instead of using your car, for the sacred cause of, well, whatever you were told the cause might be at the time.

Even the young heroes that were drafted into the army didn't have such a tough time. It was a pleasant change from the routine of shop or office and the uniform was becoming. The voyage across was exciting and it was interesting to see new countries and peoples. Best of all, you were relieved of all responsibility. You had only to do what you were told and could entirely drop that most exhausting of tasks, using your brains to think with.

Many men who served in the A. E. F. but did not actually get to the firing line still think of the war as a rather pleasing adventure, possibly the only break in a life of unspeakable boredom. It's only the poor devils that got to the front line trenches and took part in the offensives that have any idea what it was all about. They have very little to say about their war experiences. Small wonder. For them the war is only the memory of a great horror. Would that these men controlled the Legion. If they did, we would hear less spouting of bombastic super-patriotism from that quarter. But alas, the great bulk of its membership is made up of men who never got within a thousand miles of the enemy and who think of the war as a sort of glorified football match.

We pacifists are often accused of being ideally romantic. What nonsense. We are the only ones that are practical enough to face the facts. We know that the ultimate result of every war, both for the victor and the vanquished, is death, destruction, poverty, disease, crime and misery and that the whole world is suffering today as a result of its madness of 1914. Those romanticists who talk about the glories of war, the honor of nations, avenging insults to the flag, and all that out-worn jargon of war psychology, have a mentality largely influenced by the pretty picture posters our Uncle Sam uses to influence young men to enlist in the army or navy.

When international disarmament conferences first came into fashion a few years ago, I hailed them with joy. What a fine thing it was to see statesmen representing the great powers seated around a table amicably discussing reductions in armaments and how simple it would be to reduce either armies, navies or both by 25, 50 or even 75 per cent without in any way affecting their relative strength.

Strange as it may seem, however, after every disarmament conference, army and navy budgets instead of shrinking have grown larger than ever, and ever since the London conference there has been persistent lobbying in Washington to influence Congress to sanction building up our fleet to parity with that of Great Britain in accordance with the treaty that resulted from that conference.

So I have come to the conclusion that these so-called disarmament conferences are merely called for friendly discussion of matters of professional interest by naval technicians who have about as much interest in reducing the size of navies as a convention of plumbers would have in voting to abolish the great American bath-tub.

Perhaps the American people do not want disarmament. Those of us that profit by selling armor plate and ammunition and clothing and shoes to the Navy Department certainly do not, but a paring down of the $700,000,000 we now spend annually on our army and navy would help considerably in balancing the budget and lightening the tax burden, and if that seems desirable it might be a good idea to let the real friends of disarmament have something to say at these conferences and keep the professional army and navy experts in the background.

IVAN VON AUW.

Wellesley, Massachusetts.

The Field

(Continued from page 194)

placency in others. We believe that that spirit must be recognized and branded for what it is wherever it appears among us and that we and our churches must stand uncompromisingly against it not only when it threatens the sancity of our own homes but when it brings injustice and suffering to God's children anywhere."

Calling upon the ministers of the conference to impress upon their congregations the importance of a social creed which places human welfare higher in the scale of values than property the report declared:

"We welcome all plans honestly put forward for the solution of existing evils in our economic life and call upon those leaders of industry whose position gives them influence and whose knowledge and experience should give special capacity for dealing with these problems to seek solutions which shall express the spirit and teachings of Jesus.

"If the Christian reorganization of our economic world, which we believe to be essential to the welfare and happiness of society at large, can not be effected under the so-called capitalistic system which now prevails, then we shall welcome the coming of some other economic system. Human welfare must be supreme."

The report condemned war and urged that the United States adhere to the World Court and co-operate with the League of Nations "to the largest possible degree in every action looking toward prevention of war and establishment of friendly relations among the nations."

Much of the misery in the world can be traced directly to the World War, the report declared, and if for no other reason "the institution of which that conflict was an expression, should be condemned.

"We condemn the war system as un-Christian and for ourselves we renounce it as a possible method of settling international differences hereafter.

"Since recent events in the Far East have demonstrated anew the fallacy of the common distinction between wars of defense and those of agression we make our indictment against all war.

"We believe in immediate, general and drastic reduction of armaments. We welcome the present World Disarmament Conference and urgently request our representatives in that conference to take the lead in seeking surer pathways to permanent peace.

"We condemn every agency or movement that seeks to foster the military spirit among the youth of our land, especially all compulsory military training in colleges and all military training whatever in our secondary schools.

"We hold that while all Christians should be good citizens, yielding full allegiance and support to the state, such loyalty does not include service which to the individual would involve disobedience to conscience or to God. We believe that the church should support those who in the exercise of this fundamental right of conscience refuse to take part in war or in military training."

Commenting on inter-racial problems, the report urged ministers and people to put into practice at every

possible opportunity the Christian spirit of friendliness and understanding toward all persons "who differ from us in race, color or creed."

Newark *Evening News.*

Anti-Militarist Ministers

There is in existence an International Union of Anti-Militarist Ministers and Clergymen, with headquarters at Ammerstol, Netherlands. Representatives from Austria, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, France, Germany, Great Britain, Netherlands, Norway and Sweden met at the second congress in Zurich last September, and resolved to ask all authorities, ministers and members of Christian churches:

1. To recognize jointly before God our share in the responsibility for the present state of war between the nations from which humanity generally is suffering, and which constantly threatens us with a still greater evil;

2. To reflect that, if the churches do not immediately refuse to sanction war in all its forms and with all its preliminaries, they will be promoting a disaster which will hurl them, their constructive agencies and the whole of our civilization to destruction;

3. To declare fearlessly, even in the face of governments, and more particularly in anticipation of (next year's) Disarmament Conference, the will of Jesus Christ not to tolerate on any pretext the horrors of war;

4. To seek and to affirm to one another, even across national frontiers, the common faith which is stronger than all which divides us;

5. To accept gladly in the name of the Lord all the trials and all the suffering which a campaign on behalf of peace may involve.

The *Survey Graphic.*

Salvation Army on Prohibition

[Statement by Colonel Davis]

"Out of more than a million cases we have dealt with in the last sixteen months, there were only seventy-five bad cases of drink, and of moderate cases, only 500.

"From October 11, 1930, to February 3, 1932, we helped 1,102,545 unemployed men. Of this number, we found 99.92 per cent drink-free. Having nothing to do, many of these men would have drunk to excess if they could get the liquor.

"I did not realize the small percentage of drinking men that pass through our doors until I personally checked it up.

"The number of women coming to our doors with a tale of being ruined by drink is less than 1 per cent of the entire number, whereas in former days it was a considerable proportion.

"In our family welfare relief work in these days we seldom find need arising from strong drink on the part of one or other of the parents, whereas in the old days it was 90 out of 100 cases. In fact, poverty from drink has almost disappeared.

"The old-time drunkard, the wets of the country notwithstanding, is gone.

"Before Prohibition the Salvation Army would gather drunks by the truckload and busload from the saloons and park benches. Today one would have to search high and low in every American city to find at one time 100 men and women of the type the Salvation Army used to gather by the thousands under the rule of John Barleycorn."

La Follette's
Great National Weekly Newspaper
THE PROGRESSIVE
Subscription Price $1.50 Per Year

In every issue it is fighting your battles against monopoly and organized wealth in government

SPECIAL OFFER
3 Months
— 12 — ISSUES 20c

STARTLING facts suppressed by other papers will be revealed in the next few issues. Send 20 cents today and be sure to receive the next extraordinarily interesting issues of La Follette's great weekly newspaper. The Progressive, Dept. B., Madison, Wis.

TO UNITY READERS

Greetings from a like minded person who has a delightful country place on the East shore of Lake Michigan which she would like to share with you.

One hundred or more people can be accommodated—an ideal spot for group conferences on social questions. If interested write—

ERMINA MOORE
Syringa Bluff South Haven, Mich.

Just Out

A Charming Gift Book

THE HEART OF SCOTT'S POETRY

A Selection of the Best Poetry
of Sir Walter Scott
With a Critical Introduction,
By
JOHN HAYNES HOLMES

This beautiful volume was prepared and published in recognition of the Scott Centenary (1832-1932)

Price $2.50

Order of your bookseller or of the publishers

Oxford University Press
114 Fifth Avenue New York City

The May-June issue of
The New Humanist

Containing:

OF THEE I SING
by Frank Lloyd Wright

TWO SONNETS
by Hugh Robert Orr

DOCTRINAL FUNCTIONS AND RELIGIOUS DOCTRINES
By Cassius J. Keyser

A NEW MIDWESTERN FRONTIERSMAN
by E. T. Knower

A STUDENT OF DILTHEY
by Hans-Joachim Schoeps

TRAGIC AMERICA
by Carl Henry Grabo

SPECIAL OFFER

The New Humanist ($1.00 yearly; 20c a copy) will be sent in combination with any of the following books at reduced prices (regular price of book in brackets) The New Humanist for one year

With: Sir James Jeans "The Mysterious Universe" ($1.00)—$1.65
With: Norman Thomas, "As I See It" ($2.00) $2.50
With Twenty-two Authors "Living Philosophies" ($2.50)—$2.75
With: Curtis Reese "Humanist Religion" ($1.00)—$1.65
With: A. E. Haydon "The Quest of the Ages" ($2.50)—$3.00
With: Walter Lippmann "A Preface to Morals" ($1.00)—$1.65

If book you want is not listed here, send for prices. Please send check or money order, otherwise books will be mailed C. O. D. All orders must be placed with

THE NEW HUMANIST
14 West First Street, Dayton, Ohio